UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,007	01/10/2001	Leonard I. Zon	701039-50920	8096

7590 03/09/2004

David S. Resniick
NIXON PEABODY LLP
101 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
LI, QIAN JANICE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1632	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/758,007	ZON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Q. Janice Li	1632	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on *23 February 2004*. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: *The proposed amendment would raise new issue under 35 § 112, 2nd paragraph*.

3.☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4.☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6.☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8.☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10.☐ Other: _____

JANICE LI
PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The arguments drawn to amended claims are moot because the amendment has not been entered.

With respect to arguments addressing rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, in addition to reiterate and re-organizing the previous arguments, applicants's arguments emphasized the numbers of references used by the Office to construct the 103, suggesting that the Office has to rely on excessive numbers of references to construct the 103 rejections. In response, the court has stated reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants also argue that it is easy to construct the 103 rejections in light of the applicants' disclosure, suggesting that the Office has drawn the conclusion of obviousness based on improper hindsight reasoning. In response, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, all the knowledge needed in the rejection to bridge the gap between references can be found in the reference cited as discussed in detail in the final rejection. The rejection does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, thus, the reconstruction is considered proper. Accordingly, the rejections stand.